BABCOCK'S ESCAPE

Was It Devised and Managed at the National Capital?

STARTLING OFFICIAL HISTORY.

Attorney General Edwards Pierrepont as a Presidential Catspaw.

DAMAGING DOCUMENTARY DISCLOSURES

Grant Cognizant of All the Babcock Evidence Before the Grand Jury,

THE MILITARY COURT DODGE.

Atrocious Attempt to Steal Proof from a Civil Court at the Bayonet's Point.

WHY SENATOR HENDERSON WAS DISCHARGED.

Grant and Pierrepont Intimidate Witnesses Before the Trial and Coax Them After It.

Sr. Louis, April 4, 1876. There has been so much mystery and misrepresenta tion concerning the whiskey trials here, and especially General Babcock's trial, and there is still so little hope apparently of the public enlightenment from official quarters either in Washington or here, that the following summary but accurate history of these transactions may be of interest to your readers. It is obtained from conversation with many well informed persons, ntains copies of important documents and is be lieved to be substantially accurate.

Joyce was convicted late in September, and about that time the "Sylph" despatch of Babcock was discovered. From this time suspicion against Babcock began slowly to deepen, and it may be said that Justice was on his track and that he knew it and was trying hir best to evade her. McDonald was convicted on the 22d of November, Avery on the 3d of December, and it was during the Avery trial that the main body of the Babcock telegrams became public. So much will fix the relation of dates in the story which follows.

It became probable in October that General Babcock would be involved in some way and to some extent in frauds, and from this time the attitude of Attorney General Pierrepont toward the prosecutions began to assume a different color. He had been up to that time zealous in co-operating. Thereafter it was felt here that he regarded the officers of justice with suspicion, and while they undoubtedly felt this, and could have given any very clear reason for their suspicions for some time thereafter. It may be said, perhaps, that his zeal for the prosecutions abated, and his anxiety for the safety of persons to be prosecuted began to be manifested. On the 19th of October Mr. Dyer received the following despatch:-

DAVID P. DYER, Esq., United States Attorney, St. Louis, Mo.:

Str.—At your earliest convenience I wish you to come to Washington for fuller consultation than we can have by letter in the whiskey cases. Telegraph when you will come. Very respectfully,

EDWARDS PIERREPONT, Attorney General.

Mr. Dyer went to Washington, where Mr. Pierrepont told him that he and Secretary Bristow were very anxious to know what evidence he had against Babtock, cautioning him, at the same time, not to find an indictment on anything but strong evidence. But he all, and the Secretary was very indignant at the sup-position. He told Dyer he had better go back and atnd to his duties, and to make no further communication to Pierrepont unless the latter would take the full responsibility on himself of these prosecutions, in ch case Dyer was told to turn all the evidence over to him, and then Pierrepont could determine how far he chose to go. Dyer went to Pierrepont with this proposition, but the Attorney General would not agree to it. He told Dyer, however, that he wanted all the evidence in order to determine in his own mind he had anything more than the "Sylph" despatch on which to indict Babcock. Dyer said he had and gave him some other facts. At another interview Pi pont asked Dyer if that was all and thought what he had been told was insufficient. Dyer told him he had more evidence still. Pierrepont thought it still insufbeient, and insisted that Over on his return here should send him all the evidence he had.

The language and attitude of the Attorney General produced their effect upon Dyer, as was inevitable, Thereafter he felt bound to communicate fully to Pierrepont all that he was doing, and thus on the 3d o f November he telegraphed:—Sr. Louis, Nov. 3, 1875.

To Hon. EDWARDS PIERREPOST, Attorney Washington, D. C.:—
Examined Fitzroy before the Grand Jury yesterday,
His testimony is most important—so much so that I
seem it proper to send copy by mail to you.
DAVID P. DYER, United States District Attorney.

On the same day Dyer wrote to Pierrepont saying, "I will keep you fully advised;" and, to show how en irely Pierrepont had made himself, instead of the Secretary, Dyer's chief, Dyer added:- "Will you do m he kindness to let General Bristow see the evidence of Fitzroy, as I have not time to have a copy made for him?" Nor did Pierrepont tail to flatter him. No. vember 8 Dyer received a despatch from Pierrepont, giving his "best commendation both for your zeal and discretion;" and when, on the 22d, Dyer telegraphed bim that McDonald had been found guilty, he received the next day the following, which compares curiously with Mr. Pierrepont's letter to district attorneys in January. But Babcock was not yet indicted:—

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE, WASHINGTON, NOV. 23, 1875. {
Hop. D. P. Dyer, United States Attorney, St. Louis,

Mo.:—
I wish to congratulate you on your great success in the late trials, and to add that your energy, discretion and good judgment, aided by the energy, discretion and good judgment of your associates, Mr. Henderson and Mr. Eaton, have my highest approbation. Please accept the thanks of this department, and read this despatch to Mr. Henderson and Mr. Eaton.

EDWARDS PIERREPONT, Autorney General. BARCOCK'S TURN COMING.

Meantime Babcock's troubles had become, it is believed, the subject of Cabinet conversations about the middle of November, and Babcock had himself sent trials then going on, and apprise him of what might be developed. It is probable that Babcock had become aware that Dyer had issued a subpura ducer tecum to the telegraph company to obtain certain despatches now famous, and that he was very uneasy. He was urged by Avery and others here to come on and swear himself clear on Macdonald's trial, as he was told Avery, McKee and Maguire were going to do, and as the two last named did, McKee after thus swearing being convicted and Maguire pleading guilty.

Knowing that Dyer would get the despatches Rab. spatches to and from Luckey, which are dated November 17 and 18, as follows:-

O. E. HABCOCK.

WASHINGTON, D. C., NOV. 17, 1875.
LEVI P. LECKEY, Lindell Hotel, St. Louis, Mo.:—
Tell him employ assesstance if he wants, and means; but to prevent my going there now at all harards. Extractes your best judgment now.

OSCAR.

Seneral O. E. Barcock, Washington, D. C.:—
K. says no detriment, no danger, personal, political protherwise, should you could. Bully and all others upon whom Mack's case rests are going to feedily; and triends think it would be went if you could also; so all

Washingros, D. C., Nov. 18, 1875.
LEVI P. LUCKEY, Lindell Hotel, St. Louis, Mo.:
Frends advise not to go. A friend leaves to-night, I can make addaynt if needed, Yours received. Will attend to bondage Hamlet. All well.

OSCAR.

attend to bendage Hamlet. All well. OSCAR.
St. Louis, Mo., Nov. 18, 1875.
General O. E. Babcock, Washington, D. C.:—
After consultation K. says you will not be asked to come. Rogers rung in to day. Did you get my despatch about bondage Hamlet? LEVI P. LUCKEY. Babcock's refusal, under the circumstances, was wise, for on the 29th of November Dyer sent the following letter and inclosures to Pierrepont:-

Party.

I should like to have your impressions after reading these despatches. Very respectfully,

DAVID P. DYER, District Attorney.

Hon. EDWARDS PIERREPONT, Attorney General, Wash-

ington, Q. C.

[The inclosures.]

[The inclosures.]

[General O. E. Barcock, Executive Mansion, Washington, D. C., care President Grant:—

Poor Ford is dead, McDonald is with his body. Let the President act cautiously on the successorship.

JOHN A. JOYCE.

OCTOBER 27, 1873.
General O. E. Barcock, Executive Mansion, Washington, D. C., care of President Grant:—
The bondsmen prefer the man they have recommended. An expression from the President to his friends here will secure everything. Let the President do for the best, depending upon McDonald and myself to stand by his action to the last. JOHN A. JOYCE.

General O. E. BARCOCK, Executive Mansion, Washing. ton, D. C.:-See despatches sent to President, We mean it, Mum. JOHN A JOYCE.

St. Louis, March 14, 1874. General O. E. Bancock, Executive Mansion, Washing-General O. E. Bancock, Executive Mansion, Washington, D. C.:—
Start for San Francisco to-morrow night. Make D. call off his scandal hounds that only blacken the memory of F. and friends. Business.

St. Louis, Oct. 25, 1874.

General O. E. Bancock, Executive Mansion, Washington, D. C.:—
Have you talked with D.? Are things right? How?

General O. E. Babcock, Executive Mansion, Washington, D. C.:—
Has Secretary or Commissioner ordered anybody here?

St. Louis, Feb. 3, 1875. General O. E. Barcock, Executive Mansion, Washington, D. C.:—
We have official information that the enemy weakens. Push things.

SYLPH. ST. LOUIS, April 23, 1875.

General O. E. Babcock, Executive Mansion, Washing.

ton, D. C.:—
Tell Mc. to see Parker, of Colorado, and telegram to
Commissioner. Crush out the St. Louis enomies.

ORIT.

PRESIDENT GRANT INFORMED. Lucien Eaton, Dyer's assistant, had also notified the Solicitor of the Treasury, and on the following day Dyer received the following despatch:-

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE, WASHINGTON, Nov. 30, 1875.

D. P. DYER, Esq., St. Louis, Mo.:—
We have seen Mr. Eaton's despatch to the Solicitor.
Proceed with caution; be sure of your ground. Protect the innocent, but prosecute the guilty.

B. H. BRISTOW, Secretary of the Treasury,
EDWARDS PIERREPONT, Attorney General.

On the same day, the 30th, the despatches were laid y Mr. Bristow and Mr. Pierrepont before he President in Washington, and Babcock was called in to explain them. He did give an explanation, but to the President, and in such terms that Mr. Pierreintelligible to him because Babcock addressed the President and referred constantly to circumstances which Mr. Pierrepont did not comprehend. But the Attorney General said that he and General Bristow orged upon Babcock on that occasion the necessity of going to St. Louis at once to explain before the Court, and that finally General Babcock wrote a long despatch, which Mr. Pierrepont abbreviated and rewrote, and this was the telegram sent on the 30th of November as

Washington, Nov. 30, 1875.

To the Hon. D. P. Dyrn, United States District Attorney, St. Louis:

1 am absolutely innocent, and every telegram which I sent will appear perfectly innocent the moment I can be heard. I demand a hearing before the Court, where I can testify.

Description.

Dyer, as is k spiracy case would open on the 15th of December. At that time, only two weeks off, Babcock could get the hearing he was then-under the spur of Bristow's urging, as now appears—demanding. But Babcock had no stomach, apparently, for a civil court. Hence, as is evident, on the 2d of December he demanded of the President

and on the same day Dyer received this:-

DEFARTMENT OF JUSTICE, WASHINGFOX, Dec. 2. 18:5. SIR—General Babcock, on account of the charges appearing against him in the public journals, has made a formal demand, as an officer of the army, for a court of inquiry, which i suppose, as a matter of course, will be ordered. What is the condition of St. Louis? Answer at once. ordered. What is the community at once.

EDWARDS PIERREPONT, Attorney General EDWARDS States Attorney, St. Louis, Mo.

D. P. Dyer, United States Attorney, St. Louis, Mo. December 3 the President ordered the court, and he Secretary of War ordered Generals Sheridan, Hanoock and Terry to form it, to convene at Chicago on the 9th, and directed the Judge Advocate General to appoint a judge advocate. On that Dyer sent the following:— Sr. Louis, Dec. 3, 1875.
To Hon. Edwards Pierreport, Attorney General

Washington, D. C.:—
Your despatch saying that General Babcock, on account of the charges appearing against him in the public journals, has made a formal demand, as an officer of the army, for a court of inquiry, was received by me this morning. No bill of indictment has been returned against him as yet. I am not able to say whether the Grand Jury will make a presentment or not. Do you understand that, as a courf of inquiry is ordered, that that supersedes an inquiry before the court here? Please give me your views and opinion.

DAVID P. DYER, District Attorney, and the following massed in the order given:—

And the following passed in the order given:-

DEFARTMENT OF JUSTICE, WASHINGTON, Dec. 3, 1875.

Hon. D. P. Dyrk, U. S. Attorney, St. Louis, Mo.:—
Decided in Cabinet to-day that a court of inquiry be held immediately at Chicago. See my letter by this mail. Does not supersede.

EDWARDS PIERREPONT, Attorney General.

EDWARDS PIERREPONT, Attorney General,

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE, 1

WASHINGTON, Dec. 3, 1876.

DEAR SIR—In Cabinet to day the question was discussed, and the President has ordered a court of inquiry upon the demand of General Babcock. It will be convened immediately, at Chicago, and it the court requires your aid in getting evidence against General Babcock, in your possession or under your control, you will give every meinty which can promote a thorough investigation. This court of inquiry does not restrain you in any duty which the law imposes upon'you in your official capacity.

It seems to be considered that when an officer has a grave charge publicly made against him he has a right to a court of inquiry. The court will be composed of high officers—Licutenant General Sheridan, General Hancock and General Terty—and there will be an advocate general. Yours, very truly.

EDWARDS PIERREPONT, Attorney General.

D. P. Dyer, United States Attorney, St. Louis, Mo. December 4 Asa Baird Gardner was named Judge

December 4 Asa Baird Gardner was named Judge Advocate, Colonel Ruger telegraphing a reluctant asremains to be explained why he should have been chosen, busily engaged as he was with classes at the bers of the court received a singular despatch from the War Department, saying, "It is very important you should be there in time." Why? If the court was really called to act, and to deliberate, it was not "very ntended to use these honorable officers composing it, to grab the Babcock evidence and witnesses away from the officers of the civil court, and

and the whole course. and the whole course of justice at St. Louis, then, certainly, there was need for the haste which Mr. Beikhap, General Babcock's intimate friend, urged. It was well coown that the Grand Jury was then in session here. that Babcock's case, among others, was before it, and, to far from hurrying the assembly of the military court, it would have been but decent to delay it until the civil inquest then going on was concluded. Gene-

On the 6th the cat was let out of the bag. Pierrepout wrote to Dyer:-DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE, WASHINGTON, Dec. 6, 1875.

Hon. D. P. Dyer, United States Attorney, St. Lou

The President informs me that the court of inquiry

Concerning this singular demand upon Dyer, Mr tions of the President, and supposed it to be all right because he himself knew nothing of military law. The President told him to have the evidence sent to the Judge Advocate. Ought an Attorney General to be at the same time so ignorant and so complaisant? The President originally wanted the whole civil proceed-ings dropped and the case handed over entirely to the military inquiry; but this his Cabinet would not stand and rather than make a scandal he yielded. If Dyor and Henderson had been made of the same material as

SCORCHING ANSWER:

TO Hon. EDWARDS PIERREPONT, Attorney General, Washington, D. C.:

The Grand Jury to-day returned a true bill for conspiracy to defraud the revenue against Orville E. Babcock. I have a despatch from the Judge Advocate of the court of inquiry at Chicago asking for charges and evidence against General Babcock. I know of nothing which can be called charges except this indictment and what transpired in the legitimate discharge of duty by the attorneys of the government in the trials of John McDonaid and William O. Avery. Shall I order copies of the stenographic reports of those trials for the Judge Advocate? Is it expected that documentary evidence brought into the District Court of the United States for that district by its process, and which is constantly needed in the prosecution of cases pending before it and before the Circuit Court of this district, shall be transmitted by me to Chicago, beyond their jurisdiction? I respectfully suggest that I have no power to do so without contempt of this Coart. I also suggest that the government is now ready to enter upon the trial of the indictment, and for that purpose I am sending to Chicago a copy of the indictment and a capita for General Babcock. DAVID P. DYER, District Atterney.

Thus this little plot was spoiled; for on the 10th, the

Thus this little plot was spoiled; for on the 10th, the day following Dyer's scorener, General Sheridan administered another. He telegraphed that the military court, having heard that the civil court had found at ndictment against Babcock, had at once and unani civil tribunal had decided. But this did not suit Babcock, evidently; he did not mean to have a real mil later, he wrote to the President suggesting that the order convening the military court be which was accordingly done on the 15th, the proceed ings closing with a long report from Judge Advocate
Asa Baird Gardner, in which he attacks Dyer with great neat for "failing to obey the positive instruc-tions" of the Attorney General as to handing him over elt that Dyer had treated him with just contemp as an ignorant and presumptuous moddler. This Gardner, by the way, is law professor at West Point. Is he a fit person to teach cadets their duty and position toward the civil authorities?

This brings us to the loth of December. But mean time other matters had passed. When the Babcock despatches were read in court the President began to openly exhibit dislike and suspicion of ex-Senator Henderson, associate counsel for the government in the whiskey frauds. He had received, so long ago as July, a letter from W. Barnard, of St. Louis, in which Barnard told him that Henderson was the President's "bitter enemy," and that Babcock's name was getting mixed up in the whiskey business; but it was not

Mr. Henderson's speech, on which he was dismissed was made in the Avery case, on the 3d of December. His removal was spoken of between the President, Mr. Pierrepont, and perhaps General Bristow, before he made that speech; but he was not removed until the 9th. On the 7th Dyer received the following de-

Spatch:—

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE, WASHINGTON, Dec. 7, 1870.

Hon. D. P. Dykr, United States Attorney, St. Louis, Sir.—To-day was read in the Cabinet what purported Six—To-day was read in the caoince what purported to be the substance of the speech made by Senator Henderson in summing up the evidence on the trial of Avery. It was printed in the Unicinnati Commercial with extensive comments. If the substance of the speech is there correctly given the attack upon the President made by Senator Henderson on that occasion was bitter, vindictive, quite out of place, and to come from one in the employment of the government onlice surprising.

nent quite surprising.

It was deemed just that your notice should be called to this public attack, thus publicly stated to have been made by one of the counsel of the government. Will you show this letter to Senator Henderson, and will you send a copy of his speech and such copy as he will etamine and say is correct?

It is very unjust to him to have such a speech published if he did not make it, and it is grossly unjust to the President if he did. I await your answer, and ask that Senator Henderson may join in the same, or write directly to the President or to me, as he may prefer. Very respectfully,

EDWARDS PIERREPONT, Attorney General.

On the same day Lucien Eaton, assistant to Dyer telegraphed the Attorney General about Henderson's speech; that he did not understand Henderson to be offensive to the President He said :-

To EDWARDS PIERREPONT, Attorney General, Washin

To Edwards Pierreport, Attorney General, Washington, D. C.:—
As parties in sympathy with the unconvicted members of the Whiskey King here are assiduously disseminating the idea that General Henderson criticised the President in his argument of the Avery case, it is simple justice to say his speech, which was wholly unpremeditated in form, does not bear any such interpretation in my judgment. None of the newspapers report him accurately. He intended no criticism, as I know privately. I heart all he said, and did not so understand him. A sworn copy from official stenographier's notes will be mailed you by me to night. Henderson took occasion to say in the trial that the despatches exonerated the President, and I know he meant it.

But the President and Pierrepont were determined o get Henderson out, and on the 9th Dyer received the following:-

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE, WASHINGTON, Dec. 9, 1876. Hon. D. P. DYER, United States Attorney, St. Loui

Mo.:—
Evidence has reached here that on the trial of Avery
Mr. Henderson took advantage of his position as
special counsel for the government to assail the President, who was not on trial. His efforts in that line
will be no longer path by this department. You will
give a copy of this despatch to General Henderson.
EDWARDS PIERREPONT, Attorney General. On the 18th, the next day, he received another de-

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE, WASHINGTON, Dec. 10, 1875.
D. P. DYER, United States Attorney, St. Louis

at St. Louis.

You will advise General Henderson of his discharge from further service, and receive in his place the aid of the most able and efficient counsel you can find, without regard to his politics.

EDWARDS PIERREPONT, Attorney General.

nenderson's offence, Now, what was the great offence of Mr. Henderson which caused a too subservient Cabinet, led by Bel-knap and Pierrepont, to require his removal? Here is

THE NEXT STEP.

saw himself compelled to appear before a civil tribu-nal. If Bell, the detective, may be credited be was employed to get all the evidence against Babcock and bring it to the Lindell House to be destroyed. Bell's testimony is corroborated in many minor points; but whether he tells the truth or not it is undoubtedly a fact that the Attorney General and the President at Washdence against Babcock. As to the President, Mr. Pierre-pont has said that he was surprised to find him so well informed; that he always knew more than Pierreont. In a paper which has just come to my hands in Washington that "while this Grand Jury was in named Fox, who had formerly been chairman of the Republican State Committee of Missouri, was supply-ing President Grant information concerning everything curry favor with the President, and that he prejudiced the President greatly against the officers of the gov ernment at St. Louis. He said that Fox'rep to the President with the evident purpose of de-stroying confidence in him, that he had himself while the question of preparing an indictment was being considered by the Grand Jury. Mr. Dyer he did take the stand as a witness to identify the handwriting of Babcock in the 'Sylph' telegram which was in evidence before the jury. When he did so this juryman, Fox, asked whether he was giving sworn testimony, and he then took the oath as a witness. But he did not give any testimony against Babcock, as was reported to the President. Mr. Dyer said that on coming to Washington, after the indictment was found by the Grand Jury, he found Mr. Fox there in consultation with the highest officers of the government, and ward appointed to a consulship by the President."

As to the Attorney General's search for information,

you have seen above that he demanded everything from Dyer. He put a good face on, however. On the 27th of December he wrote Dyer, telling him, among other things, to "proceed calmly, earnestly and with unflinching justice toward all;" and added, "Read this to Mr. Eaton and associates. • The sentimen and drift of it you need not especially conceal." This made poor Dyer's heart jump with joy, and he immediately telegraphed to Pierrepont:—

St. Louis, Mo., Dec. 29, 1875.

Hon. EDWARDS PIERREPONT, Attorney General, Washington, D. C.

Hon. Edwards remained ington, D. C.:—
Have shown your letter to Brodhead, who thinks it would be well to publish so much of it as relates to the vigorous prosecution against the ring. Shall it be done?

D. P. DYER, District Attorney. lone? D. P. DYER, District Attorney.
Pierrepont just as immediately telegraphed him to

forbid the publication:

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE, 1
Department of WASHINGTON, Dec. 30, 1875. (Hon. D. P. Dyen, United States Attorney, St. Louis, Mo.:

Not well to publish. See my letter of to-day. Learn that there will be no important trials until Judge Dillon comes, on the 20th.

EDWARDS PIERREPONT, Attorney General.

Not only this, but he wrote him, and took occasion to caution him severely against being too zealous. But

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE, WASHINGTON, Dec. 30, 1875. Hon, D. P. Dyer, United States Attorney, St. Louis,

Hon. D. P. Dyen, United States Attorney, St. Louis, Mo.:—
DEAR Sin—The publication of any part of official letters tends to create speculation and unhealthy excitement, and hence better not be published at present, I am gind to learn that Judge Treat and Judge Dillon will both sit on the 20th of January to try the revenue cases. This will satisfy the public and all parties of the public that you intend to try the cases deliberately, with abundant caution and with a fairness which cannot be doubted. It is important, as I have already said, that impartial justice be done, and also that there be no appearance even of rashness, haste, prejudice or favoritism; but in the present state of the public mind it is important that the trial be so conducted that honest men cannot doubt the fairness of the trial or the justice of the result. Ever truly yocrs, EDWARDS PIERREPONT, Attorney General.

P. S.—Please send me the evidence before the Grand Jury in the Babcock case.

EDWARDS PIERREPONT, Attorney General.

And poor Dyer had to submit, in these words:—

And poor Dyer had to submit, in these words :-UNITED STATES ATTORNEY'S OFFICE, Sr. LOUIS, Jan. 3, 1876.

Hop. Edwards Pierreport, Attorney General, Wash-

ington, D. C.:—
Sin—The moment that I get the notes of the testimony taken before the Grand Jury written out I will transmit, according to the request contained in your letter of the 30th ult, so much as relates to the case

letter of the 30th ult., so much as relates to the case against General Babcock. I am, very respectfully, your obedient servant.

DAVID P. DYER, United States Attorney.

PROTECTING BARCOCK.

During January Dyer had business in the East. While

During January Dyer had business in the East. While he was in Washington the Attorney General questioned him, and Dyer told him about the despatches in cipher between Babcock and Luckey, and also about the Grimes letters, thus giving him two most important pieces of the evidence. At this time Tutton had been sent to Chicago, as being the most subservient tool in the revenue service to the President's wishes. And no sooner had Tutton got out here than—so Mr Pierrenewspaper cuttings and anonymous letters telling them that some moustrous scandal was about to be lone in the name of justice in the West. Thereupon ensued Pierrepont's notorious letter to district attor-neys threatening witnesses, which was after all, per-haps, the most effective device, as is well understood here, to help Babcock. In that letter Mr. Pierrepont gives as his excuse for writing it that his "attention has been called to a number of newspapers." But Mr. Pierrepont has since said that he saw, in fact, no newspapers, but only cuttings shown him by the President; that he could not remember the origin of any except some which were published in the Inter-Ocean of Chicago, and which he afterward discovered had been put in by Supervisor Tutton, and that he remembered only two men who spoke to the President'r him on the submen who spoke to the President'r him on the subject, one of whom was Tutton. Fernaps the other
was the Grand Juror Fox! Besides this, he has said
that he received on the subject two letters, both
anonymous, and one postmarked St. Louis!

Mr. Pierrepont has given some singular details to
several persons about the history of this letter to
district afterneys. According to these accounts of his

the President always conversed with him alone when he urged the writing of the letter, and he dealt at first mainly in hints and suggestions, which Mr. Pierrepont was slow to take. He saw that in some of the newspaper cuttings which the President called his attention to were charges against the officers of justice in St. Louis. Finally, after several of these private interviews, the President, finding that he did not get ahead, "spoke with distinctness about writing to the district attorneys," and said, "I want to have you write to these district attorneys and prevent any such wrong as this being done. It will bring a great scandal." This was in reference to the District Attorney at St. Louis. So Mr. Pierrepont wrote the letter, and later the President asked him, "Have you done anything about that?" meaning the letter. Whereupon Pierrepont sent him a copy of it, "in an official cuvelope, sealed" and directed to the President. When, after some days, he found that it had been unde public, he says he used severe language before the President about it; but the President did not seem to remember anything about the letter, manifested not the least interest in it and had never o it, which is quite odd, considering how anxious he

to the President, General Babcock recently declared, so the papers report, that he found open and without an envelope on his deak. One is quite curious to know who opened it and laid it on Habcock's deak. Of course it could not have been the President, because he never saw the letter. Nor General Babcock, for he discovered it already opened. Mr. Pierrepont's ex-planation is curiously detailed, but unsatisfying. He discovered it already opened. Mr. Pierrepont's explanation is curiously detailed, but unsatisitying. He hands of some person who let it out to some other person who sent it to the Chicago papers;" and he adds that he "ascertained this from General Babcock," who told him, "I was drowning. They were

that I could get hold of." Another expression which Mr. Pierrepont has used, in relating the story of this letter, still further excites curiosity. "I do not say," he has said, "that General Babcock abstracted the

Pierrepont what Everest would probably testify to, and when the President and the Attorney General knew pretty much the whole case against Babcock. Now the had guilt upon their own shoulders-and necessarily all the most important ones had—that, having by their tes-timony confessed their guilt, they need hope for no par-don or clemency from Washington. Under the cir-cumstances it behooved the witnesses in the Babcock trial to be very careful what they testified; for, if they went too far, they could expect no mercy from those who wanted Babcock cleared. The general impression here is that the letter had its effect, and that the prosecution was moralized and lamed by it. Portuns very soon after General Babcock was acquitted Mr. Pierrepont revoked his letter and instructed Mr. Dyer to keep all the promises of elemency or immus which he might have made to "guilty persons."

With the exception of the Roger Sherman episode you have here a succinct account of the Babcock affair. There are many details not filled up; but the time is not far distant when most of these can be told, and when Secretary Bristow, Solicitor Wilson and perhaps some others may leel tree or obliged to tell their adventures in the matter of Mr. Babcock.

A CARD FROM DETECTIVE BELL.

It has been my misfortune to be summoned before

Congressional committee. The bread and butter

under oath, he says he did in t me of both Bristow and Jewell.

CUBAN CONTROVERSIES.

CRIME IN BROOKLYN.

Tobias Butler, residing at No. 19 North Portland

avenue, Brooklyn, quarrelled with his wife at an early hour yesterday morning and drove her from her apart-

ments. She took refuge in the rooms of Mr. Patrick Fitzgerald. Butler followed her, and finding the door locked kicked at it, which act so enraged Fitzgerald that he opened it and struck the fellow on the head with a hammer, inflicting a severe wound. The injured man was removed to the City Hoapital, and Fitzgerald was locked up at the Fourth precinct station house to answer for felonious assault.

Two sweeps, Gibert H. Perry and William Hr Smith, colored men, quarrelled on Saturday night at No. 17s. Navy street, Brooklyn, when the lottner siabled William with a penknite in the left leg, indicting a severe wound. Perry was arrested, and is held to answer.

may be characterized as follows:-

TO THE PUBLIC:-

plain food, coarse clothing and humble lodging for their work. All that they do is a labor of love and mercy, performed solely to be neat their unfortunate reliow women and to promote the glory of God.

The first American house of this Order was established in New York October 2, 1857, in a small building in Fourteenth street, by five Sisters. Since then they have erected buildings at the foot of Nimeteenth street, East River, at a cost of over \$400,000, which they now occupy. Their community has increased to 183 cloistered nuns and twenty outdoor Sisters. These latter attend to all the business of the house, such as procuring work and returning it, securing coal, provisions, &c. Since the establishment of this institution it has withdrawn from vice and sheltered over 4,000 unhappy women, and at the present time contains over 500. Another house was opened in Boston in 1867, which contains 200 penitents. Another, started the year after in Brooklyn, now has 250 inmates, while the last one, established last May in Newark, N. J., already contains forty women and girls who wish to reform. As long as there is room for one more the Sisters receive applicants, who are fed, clothed, lodged and treated in all respects alike, without regard to creed or country. Moral means only are employed, and for this reason some of the Sisters are continually present with the inmates, to animate them by example as well as by precept to the practice of virtue. The Preservation class includes those children who are generally under fourteen years of age, and wno may have been exposed, through the vice of their parents or other surroundings, to the dangers of temptation. The class of Detention is composed of older girls and women, who are placed there by their parents, guardians or other legal authority; those committed by the applicants being paid for by the city at a very low rate. The Penitents are those who voluntarily abandon evil associations, and wish to effect a radical change in the course of their lives; while the Sister Magdale the cautious, searching press outside has gradually come to the front, and "darkly, mend me for singly daring to take up the battle gauge. I say not this in a boasting spirit. I regret the war, but I have no tears to shed at this time. 'Tis now win or perish. I reaffirm that I have told the truth. Let us consider matters. Examine carefully the testimony. Secretary Chandler says Luckey never spoke to him of me. Luckey says in his testimony General Pierrepont denies that I ever held any conver-sation with him in regard to going to St. Louis, and that I was only commended to him by the President in a general way. This I deny. I was specially com-mended to him by the President as "the man of whom I spoke." The President sent me to him to tell all I knew, which I did, and directed him to appoint and send me to St. Louis. I found him intriguing with

It has been estimated that there are at least 20,000 of this class of females in New York alone. It will be observed that four houses of the Good Shepherd seclude about 1,000 of them, training them to habits of industry and establishing them in virtue, while the Women's Prison Association of New York report that "itay-mond Street Jail is a housed of vice and corruption; that what is not known to those in for first offences is soon learned from more hardened sinners." In the new House of the Good Shepherd in Brooklyn there is ample space for 500, just double the number it now contains. The tempted class are entirely separated from the graduates in vice, and it is utterly impossible for one to contaminate the other. The building is located at Atlantic and East New York avenues, with spacious grounds for recreation and exercise and in a healthful situation. Forty of the Sisters devote their time to the mission for which they were organized, and their labors are only limited by their means. They owe a debt of \$00,000 on the buildings. If this debt could be paid the Sisters do not doubt their ability to meet all further expenses from the proceeds of such work as they can get for the Inmates. As they are a cloistered Order they are unable to begin the means from door to door to liquidate this debt, and they appeal to the public to assist them, so that they may go on with the work which they have undertaken. Secretaries Bristow and Jewell, and at that time believing Babcock innocent and finding Secretary Chandler the only true friend of the President, reported in Pierrepont for betraying my proposed mission. Pierre-pont then, as I have heard, denied to the President that he ever spoke of me to either Secretary Bristow or Postmaster General Jewell. In his testimony of the as he says, they gave me a bad name, why did not he, if true to the President, inform him, and thus prevent my being commended to and given an appointment by Secretary Chandler, and as Secretary Chandler says my name was given to him by the Presi-

RECLAIMING FALLEN WOMEN.

The work of reclaiming lost women is one that owes

much to the venerable Father Eudes, who established the Order of the Daughters of Our Lady of Charity of the Good Shepherd over 300 years ago in France. This Order has grown until it reaches all the principal cities

of the world. Applicants for membership in this Order remain three or six months as postulants, then

two years and one day as novices, and when they make their yows they dedicate the remainder of their lives to the service of the most degraded women.

ood Sisters either give them a permanent home in the institution or return them to the world as useful

NEW YORK, April 6, 1876.

To what better use can the columns of an influential is certainly a highly gratifying phase of modern journalism that the press is ever ready to cry down fraud and succor the afflicted. Apropos to this sentiment is your agitation of two important themes—"Cheap Cab Hiro" and the "Proposed Reduction in Policemen's

congë, and prior to that Cabinet meeting, at which my name was, according to Chandler, openly mentioned? I suppose Mr. Pierrepont, after he saw my letter to the President, made amends by writing the ismous letter to the District Attorneys. I methin frequently. If when I took the card to him he was true to the President, why did he mention my proposed mission? Why did he question my appointment when it was desired by the President, as he himself confesses? He simply betrayed, first, the President, then in turn betrayed Britatow. Details I will not enter into, but I will state distinctly that I told him the President only desired to know whether or not Babcock was guilty. There could be nothing wrong in this. Why, then, did he betray me to Bristow, knowing I was not to be known in that quarter? All this in December last. Pierrepont first allied himself to Bristow and Jewell, and then, being caught and reported by me to the President, turned in behalf of Babcock. Either this or he was the President's spy on them. He can take his choice, but all around his conduct has been Janus haced. His actions, after my report about the 22d of December last, confirm my statement. I will here state that I found long since that Secretary Bristow was honest and acknowledge now, activithstanding all my former pre-induces at St. Louis, from what I heard there characteristics.

I have, however, taken some pains to interview officers and men and have adduced from them the following facts:—

First—The men are not encouraged or protected in the discharge of their duties by their superior officers. As an instance of this I dite the following authority:—A low weeks aince a friend's house was entered in broad daylight, in a much frequented street, and valuable silverware to a large amount was stolen. I was requested to attend to the case, and immodiately upon the discovery of the robbery went in search of an officer. After having waiked haif a mile to the nearest police station without any agas of a guardian of the peace, I stated my mission to the sergeant at the deek, who referred me to the ward detective, a sheepish looking, ignorant individual sitting drowsily near the stove, and to him I confided my errand. This follow, though lacking in that acuteness which in fiction has ever been attributed to the fraternity, was good enough to inform me that if the thief was apprechended there the matter would end. To vindicate this assertion he drew from the recesses of his pockets a "jimmy" and offering it for my inspection, said:—"The other day I arrested the owner of this while in the act of prying open a window with it, and because the man had not taken anything the magistrate relused to commit him." Without further examination of my companion I learned that the larger thewas, receivers of stolen goods, &c., wield enormous political power at Police iteadquarters, and consequently escape the pennity of their crimes. This I do not relate without good cause, as all the members of the force to whom I have talked corroborate it with similar experiences of their own.

Second—There are indubitably men wearing the unithat Secretary Bristow was honest and earnest, and acknowledge now, autwithstanding all my former prejudices at St. Louis, from what I heard there, that he was on the right track. As to Bradley, he says he wished me to steal copies of papers from Dyer's office. Strange he should draw the line at copies. I realifirm that first, he, at St. Louis, wished the originals if I could get all of them. I preferred first to see Babcock, which I did about December 23, and told him of Bradley's proposition. He showed no surprise, but said, in substance, "All of the papers must be procured—a part were worse than none." showed no surprise, out said, in substance, "All of the papers must be procured—a part were worse than none."

I left a profitable business, summoned by authority, through Bradley, to aid the President, whom we all believed was assaulted through Babcock. I fell into the hands of "theives by the wayside," and finding out the company I was in quit the case. Let minor details speak for themselves. My zeal may have misled me, for I loved the President, and still think kindly of him as my old commander. Yet this plittil beggar, Babcock, after causing me to spend thrice for him (through my devotion to the President) that he has ever repaid me, could cause a call upon Secretary Chandler for \$1,000, and upon others for greater and lesser sums, to pay the expenses of his presention—termed by his admirers his persecution. I have never bunted political criminals. I have only pursued those who were criminals against the law.

In conclusion, where are Babcock and Luckey now? Luckey is out of the White House, as may be believed, for mistaken zeal; Babcock for theft, so termet, of the lamous or inismous letter of the Autorney General. I am yet to be judged, and the testimony thus far justifies me in most of what I mave said. It would be folly to expect men to criminate themselves; therefore I was surprised to receive even a partial vindication from Babcock, Luckey and Bradley. "The truth is mighty, and will prevait." Let the great public wait, as more is yet to come, and, whatever the resuit, I shall await the verdict with patience and hopefulness.

talked corroborate it with similar experiences of their own.

Second.—There are indubitably men wearing the unform to-day in the service who should be in sing Sing or Anburn Prison.

Third.—The "beats" of many officers are so lonely and extensive that thieves have only to wait till the patrolman's back is turned to them in order to ply their nefarious calling successfully; and

Finally.—The honest officers who have been retained for years—and a lew of this class remain—are in constant terror of dismissal.

For these evils there is but one remedy, sure and simple. Ergo, say 1:—Instal honest and capable heads of the departments; let that feature of the till which recommends a thorough investigation into the moral standing of the candidate be observed to the letter; increase the force, and when good, efficient men are obtained, keep them in the position so long as they fill the posts with trust and honor; but let there be no grading of salaries to line the purses of avairious politicians, and remove the contagion of the latter as is from the force as possible. We do not want incompetent men for the sake of saving a lew paltry dollars. Every intelligent taxpayer and property holder can see at a glange that there is no economy in such a course. The scheme is as gausy and knavish as any yet offered to the public.

Trusting that the argency of thorough reform in our Within the last six weeks no less than three Cuban stered into a free fight of a partisan character. They anti-Aldama tendencies.

La Fos del Patria, organ of J. J. Govantes and in favor of President Aguilera. Mr. Govantes' name has been suggested as a candidate for the position of agent in New York of the Cuban Republic as the successor of Mr. Miguel de Aklama, who fills the position at pres-Mr. Miguel de Aldama, who filts the position at present.

La Verdad, looked upon as the organ of Mr. de Aldama by the Cuban exises in this city.

The other Cuban papers published in this city are La Independencia and La Revolucion. The former is edited by Mr. de Luna and is engaged in a bitter warfare against Mr. de Aldama.

La Revolucion, which is edited by Mr. Rafael Lunza, is the original Cuban organ published in this city and is now in its eighth year. It is independent and deprecates the bitter fight on the partisanship question which the other Cuban papers have of late allowed themselves to be dragged into and pleads for the "reaction of action" in the matter of helping their strugging brethren in Cuba with men and arms.

The scheme is an galaxy at the total public.

Trusting that the urgency of thorough reform in our poince afters will justify in your eyes my trespass on your time and space, and that at least you will present the true aspect of the matter to your subscribers (my self included), I remain very respectfully yours, M. T., Jr.

HOW TO DEMORALIZE THE POLICE.

NEW YORK, April 7, 1876.

New York, April 7, 1876.

To the Editor of the Police Commissioners by which they make any citizen of the State eligible to the position of patrelman of the police force of this city is a very poor but thrown out to country members of the Legislature. No doubt many of them may look on this as a very valuable concession; but let them consider fully the circumstances which prompted that proposition, and they will very readily see the snare set for them in the roundabout manner which the Commissioners have taken to secure their votes for whatever arbitrary measures the Board may wish to push through the Legislature. Every sensible person must understand the arduous dutes of a policeman, the strict discipline they are anti-ject to, the necessity of having their wits about them at all times, the dangers they are exposed to, likewise the shably manner in which they are pensioned after being disabled in the discharge of their duty. Taking these things under consideration the guardians of the peace have burdens to carry far heavier than their batons.

Let the Board make it a role to dismiss a police officer without the formality of a trial, and what encouragement will an officer mare to pay a struct after those to duty? It will tend to weaken his faith in the honor of advancement which he should derive from a convergement will an officer display and the my cashid opinion that the police force of this city will be greatly demoralized. At all ovents, it will be far from being the finest police in the world.

A PATROLE AND THE TAKE THE